

INDIANA DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM.

WHEREAS, The Democratic party having, from the date of its organization, been in favor of the maintenance of the Union and the preservation of the Constitution, and seeing in the present condition of the country the deplorable effects of a departure from its time-honored and conservative principles, and the triumph of sectionalism; and firmly believing that the Union and the Constitution can be preserved only by the restoration of that party to power, we invite all the Union men throughout the land to unite with us in sustaining its organization and carrying out its principles.

Resolved, 1. That we reaffirm and enforce the political principles that from time to time have been put forth by the National Conventions of the Democratic party.

2. That we are unalterably attached to the Constitution, by which the Union of these States was formed and established, and that a faithful observance of its principles can alone continue the existence of the Union, and the permanent happiness of the people.

3. That the Democratic party is, and has been, the only party that has ever been faithful to the principles of the Constitution, and that it is the only party that has ever been faithful to the principles of the Union, and that it is the only party that has ever been faithful to the principles of the people.

4. That in rejecting all propositions likely to result in a satisfactory adjustment of the matters in dispute between the North and the South, and in opposing those measures which would have secured the border slave States to the Union, and in a hasty co-operation on their part in all constitutional and legal measures to secure a return of the Southern States to their allegiance, the Republican party assumed a fearful responsibility, and acted in total disregard of the best interests of the whole country.

5. That if the party in power had shown the same desire to settle, by amicable adjustment, our internal divisions before hostilities had actually commenced, that the Administration has recently exhibited to avoid a war with our ancient enemy, Great Britain, and to peacefully settle the question of harmony would not reign throughout all our borders.

6. That the maintenance of the Union upon the principles of the Federal Constitution should be the controlling object of all who profess loyalty to the Government; and in our judgment this purpose can only be accomplished, by the ascendency of a Union party in the Southern States, which shall, by counterbalancing the influence of the secessionists, and by the control of the present legislation, that no effort to create or sustain such a party can be successful which is not based upon a definite settlement of the questions at issue between the two sections; and we therefore demand that some such settlement be made by additional constitutional guaranty, either initiated by acts of Congress or through the medium of a National Convention.

7. That the Republican party has fully demonstrated its inability to conduct the Government through its present difficulties.

8. That we are actively opposed to the twin heresies, Northern sectionalism and Southern secession, as inimical to the Constitution, and to the peace of the country, should form indignantly upon them.

9. That in this national emergency the Democracy of Indiana, basing all its feelings upon the love and respect, will recollect only their duty to the whole country; that this war should not be waged in the spirit of conquest or superiority, nor for the purpose of establishing or interfering with the rights or institutions of the South, but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution, and to preserve the Union with all the dignity, equality and rights of the several States unimpaired, and that as soon as these objects are accomplished the war ought to cease.

10. That we will sustain, with all our energies, a war for the maintenance of the Constitution, and of the integrity of the Union under the Constitution; and we are opposed to a war for the extension of the negroes, or the subjugation of the Southern States.

11. That the purposes avowed and advocated by the Democratic party, to wit: to preserve the Union, to maintain the Constitution, to preserve the rights of the people, to suppress the rebellion and to maintain the integrity of the Union, are the only purposes which should be the basis of all our action.

12. That the Democratic party is the only party that has ever been faithful to the principles of the Constitution, and that it is the only party that has ever been faithful to the principles of the Union, and that it is the only party that has ever been faithful to the principles of the people.

13. That the Democratic party is the only party that has ever been faithful to the principles of the Constitution, and that it is the only party that has ever been faithful to the principles of the Union, and that it is the only party that has ever been faithful to the principles of the people.

14. That the Democratic party is the only party that has ever been faithful to the principles of the Constitution, and that it is the only party that has ever been faithful to the principles of the Union, and that it is the only party that has ever been faithful to the principles of the people.

15. That the Democratic party is the only party that has ever been faithful to the principles of the Constitution, and that it is the only party that has ever been faithful to the principles of the Union, and that it is the only party that has ever been faithful to the principles of the people.

16. That the Democratic party is the only party that has ever been faithful to the principles of the Constitution, and that it is the only party that has ever been faithful to the principles of the Union, and that it is the only party that has ever been faithful to the principles of the people.

17. That the Democratic party is the only party that has ever been faithful to the principles of the Constitution, and that it is the only party that has ever been faithful to the principles of the Union, and that it is the only party that has ever been faithful to the principles of the people.

Speech of Mr. Van Wick, of New York.

Mr. Van Wick, Rep., chairman of the committee appointed to investigate government frauds, recently made a speech in Congress, relative to the frauds which had been perpetrated on the government, from which we make a few extracts:

PENNSYLVANIA HORSES.

Kentucky is proverbial for her splendid horses. Her loyal citizens would have been benefited by sales to the Government. Who will pretend that the public exigency required that, when cavalry regiments were to be forwarded from the State of Pennsylvania to the land of the 'dark and bloody ground,' it was necessary to transport, at great expense, the remaining disabled, diseased horses left in the Keystone State? My colleague on the committee (Mr. Dawes) a few days since spoke of the peace offerings to Pennsylvania politicians, and referred to the horses of Col. William's regiment. There is yet another case—a contract not made upon the responsibility of the bureau, as the late Secretary said, but by its express order, and refused to be made until so ordered. I refer to the contract to purchase one thousand horses, to be delivered at Huntington, Pennsylvania. Such a horse market the world never saw. The first inspector—an honest man—of the first hundred rejected three in five. The next day owners refused to present themselves, and by some legendary means he was removed and others substituted; then horses of all ages, from two to thirty, of all diseases and defects, secret and open were from day to day received. The whole neighborhood was in arms. The people remonstrated. Lawyers and clergymen were present at the inspection, and sought to deter the buccannery crew by open condemnation; the inspectors heeded not this clamor, but ordered the horses to be ridden upon the crowd, to drive them away if possible. Horses with running sores, which were seen by the inspectors, were branded, and if one outrageous common decency he would be rejected, and an opportunity sought the same day to pass and brand him. Immediately the horses were subsisted by private contract to favorites at thirty-nine cents per day, and they sub-let to farmers from 24 to 26. Over four hundred of these horses were sent with Colonel Wynnkoop's regiment, and the papers at Pittsburgh report some actually so worthless they were left on the docks. The remaining 500 were left at Huntington for the benefit of the contractors. In that single transaction over fifty thousand dollars were stolen from the Government. Such fiends in human shape care not for exposure; a felon's doom through life should be theirs; and the labors of your committee will be of little practical value unless Congress shall by law punish with severe penalties such enormities.

CONTRACT BROKERAGE.

At one time it would seem there was an intention to establish a huge contract brokerage system. The testimony of Mr. John Smith, of Kingstown, New York powder manufacturer, shows that in the month of May he proposed to give Mr. Weed a per centage for a powder contract; that he went to the Astor House, met Mr. Davidson, whom he had never seen before, and inquired of him for Mr. Thurlow Weed. During the conversation he asked what Mr. Smith wanted of Mr. Weed; on being told, he inquired of Mr. Smith what he could afford to pay; he replied five per cent. Mr. Smith also says that Mr. Weed asked him what he could afford to pay. That afterwards, at Washington, he handed his propositions for powder to Mr. Weed, who took them to Mr. Cameron. The result was that Mr. Weed was authorized to write a letter to General Ripley, the head of the Ordnance Department, to divide the contracts for powder between the States manufacturing. It is somewhat strange that the Secretary should appoint Mr. Weed as his messenger to carry his wishes to the different bureaus. Mr. Smith understood that he was to pay Mr. Weed five per cent. Mr. Laffin also testified that his powder firm demurred to paying Mr. Weed five per cent; that Mr. Weed gave them authority to make one thousand barrels of powder, but they preferred having the authority directly from the government. He also testified that the patriotic Dwyer, who figured in the cattle contract in May or June, at Washington, told him if he would give him five per cent. he would sell all the powder he could make, but Laffin declined. Favorites obtained contracts when frequently they have not the pecuniary resources of the articles to be delivered. The professional politician or the retired ex-member of Congress, who has a large contract which requires much machinery and great mechanical ingenuity, evidently takes it as a speculation; takes it to enrich himself, or to extort from the pockets of honest industry; takes it to sub-let to skillful manufacturers at reduced prices. The depart-

ments which give contracts to men, knowing that they have not in and of themselves the facilities for executing them are reprehensible, and deserve severe censure. What excuse is there for an honest department to pension this gang of middlemen? All the ill-gotten gain found in their pockets is so much stolen from the treasury. Even in the Treasury Department—pure and upright as I believe the Secretary to be—what business man could justify, or who, in his own transactions, would allow that a contract of over half a million expenditure should be competed for by only two firms, who could combine and unite? It is no answer to say that the work is done as cheaply as ever. The spirit of the law has been violated, and the millionaire enriched. Besides, the products of all departments of labor are cheapened by the stagnation of business. In this matter of the bank note contracts, as in some other, underlings control the affair of the department. They say who shall approach within the charmed circle? They say whose papers shall be put on file, and whose shall be gladdened by the eyes of the Secretary? The soldier who, borne down by disease and overcome by fatigue, is found sleeping at his post, you punish with death, while the miscreant who holds festival at this carnival of blood, rides in his carriage, drinks champagne and dines with Cabinet Ministers, you treat with deferential respect. Do you say Government can not banish treason and punish crime. On the 4th day of July, 1860, at Occoquan, Virginia, Mr. Underwood raised a pole, unfurled the American flag and a banner with the names of Lincoln and Hamlin. Jackson, the slayer of Ellsworth, with about forty men, cut it down, tore up the stars and stripes and carried off the banner as a trophy. One of the ringleaders of that mob is this day in the employ of the Government in this city. The laboring men who testify against officials are removed, while the wretch who has been robbing the Government is worthy a better place. Is it possible that this monstrous system of wrong, extending from the Atlantic to the Mississippi, from the Potomac to the Lakes, can not be stopped or even checked? If that be so, better disband our armies, and let the oligarchs of the South rule and reign over us.

MR. MORGAN'S AGENCY IN PURCHASING VESSELS.

Since this report has been submitted to the House, Mr. George D. Morgan has prepared an elaborate paper showing the benefits of his agency, and relies upon the fact that in nearly every instance he paid a less price than the owners asked. We can test the strength of his position by the Stars and Stripes. To build her cost \$36,000; by her charter her owners realized \$15,000 from Government; they then asked \$60,000. Mr. Morgan paid \$55,000—\$5,000 less than they asked, but \$19,000 more than she cost, owners received \$53,000, the Government paid \$60,000, although Mr. Morgan's papers allege he was asked \$80,000. This seems the reverse of the position. The onward was offered to private parties for \$26,000; Mr. Morgan was asked \$30,000 and paid \$27,000. These are not the only instances, as the committee will show by a further examination, to which they are invited by the Secretary, and directed by a resolution of the House. Secretary Wells, a man estimable in all the relations of private life, honest himself, and who would not take a farthing from the Treasury, seeks to justify Mr. Morgan by showing that the Government in times past was imposed upon by impositions on the regular officers; and he employs an agent with no salary, yet putting him in the position of antagonism to his Government, making his interest against it, for the greatest number of vessels bought, and the highest price paid nets him the most money. For the credit of the Government such practices should cease. We have not only a right to Mr. Morgan's skill, experience, and shrewdness, but we have a right to the benefit of that ruling feeling with many business men—that of interest for his employers. It is no answer to say that Mr. Morgan is honest. Grant it. Mr. Morgan is fond of money, or he would not be so much content to take nearly \$90,000 of the money which has been made to him in about five months. A man who is thus greedy of gain evidently is more zealous of his own than his country's interest. Besides, if the Secretary needs the native ingenuity and business capacity, which I admit is of higher order, why not employ him, and give him a fair remunerative salary, as other men are employed? He says that \$900,000 was taken from the pockets of the sellers. Not so; Mr. Morgan always notified on the purchase; that they must pay the lowest cash price, and add two and a half per cent. thereto. If Mr. Morgan possesses the business ability which the Secretary claims, and which I do not doubt, he certainly could

have obtained all the vessels at the price he did, less the two and a half per cent. Who doubts it? Why should not the sellers as readily have given the two and a half per cent. to the Government as to Mr. Morgan? No, sir; that fallacy may suit the Secretary, but it will not deceive the people. In September last, when Mr. Morgan had made over \$50,000, representation was made to the Cabinet in regard to this matter, and the attention of the Secretary directed to it. Had he changed the policy, no censure could have been charged upon him; but he persistently refused, and in December Mr. Morgan had increased his fortunes to the enormous sum of about \$90,000—at the rate of a quarter of a million per annum. Mr. Morgan's service could have been secured at \$5,000 annually and this enormous sum saved to the treasury; but if this be not so and men owning vessels have been compelled or induced to sell them at small prices, what right has the Secretary to allow his brother-in-law to put his hands in the pocket of each seller and realize the immense sum of \$90,000 in a few months? That money really belonged to the Government. As an agent he takes it; and if it be an unconscionable amount it belongs to his employers. The Secretary should know that the rules of the Chamber of Commerce in New York, as to commissions, do not apply where the value of the vessel exceeds \$30,000; beyond that sum the per centage is left to bargain between seller and broker. Can the Secretary find a solitary case where merchants have allowed two and a half per cent. on a vessel worth \$100,000? The rule in Boston is one per cent, when the value is over \$20,000.

A Letter from Secretary Stanton.

To the Editor of the N. Y. Tribune:

Sir—I cannot suffer undue merit to be ascribed to my official action. The glory of our recent victories belongs to the gallant officers and soldiers that fought the battles. No share of it belongs to me.

Much has been said of military combinations and organizing a victory. I hear such phrases with apprehension. They commenced in infidel France with the Italian campaign, and resulted in Waterloo. Who can organize victory? Who can combine the elements of success on the battle-field? We owe our recent victories to the spirit of the Lord, that moved our soldiers to rush into battle, and filled the hearts of our enemies with terror and dismay. The inspiration that conquered in battle was in the hearts of the soldiers and from on high; and wherever there is the same inspiration there will be the same results. Patriotic spirit, with resolute courage in officers and men, is a military combination that never failed.

We may well rejoice at the recent victories, for they teach us that battles are to be won now and by us in the same and only manner that they were ever won by any people or in any age since the days of Joshua, by boldly pursuing and striking the foe. What, under the blessing of Providence, I conceive to be the true organization of victory and military combination to end this war was declared in a few words by Gen. Grant's message to Gen. Duerksen—"I propose to move immediately on your works."

Yours, truly,
EDWIN M. STANTON.

What is in a Name?

There is a confounded deal in a name. You are at a public dinner table. Smith, the grocer, says 'Rice is down again.' 'Is Rice down again?' asked a minister. 'I am sorry to hear it. I was in hopes that he had permanently reformed.' 'I was speaking of rice, the vegetable,' replied the grocer. 'Oh, indeed!' exclaimed the minister. 'and I was speaking of Rice the man. Ha! he!'

'Wool has advanced,' says a dealer in that article. 'Has he,' asked a military man; 'which way is he marching now?' 'I was speaking of the wool of the sheep,' is the reply. 'I beg your pardon, I supposed you was speaking of Wool, the man.' 'What is better worth?' asked some one of the grocer. 'Butterworth is a Hard Shell Democrat,' responded a politician, whose thoughts are wholly engrossed with party matters.

'A laugh,' says Charles Lamb, is worth a hundred groans in any state of the market.

Spare that you may speed, fast that you may feast; labor that you may live; and run that you may rest.

In whatever shape evil comes, we are apt to exclaim, with Hamlet, 'Take any shape but that.'

Ingratitude is so deadly a poison that it destroys the very bosom in which it is harbored.

HEART-RENDING.

The public generally will be interested in the information which I shall proceed to impart, viz: that my patronymic is Stokes—G. W. Stokes—George Washington Stokes.

The authors of my existence probably named me after the father of my country, because of certain indications which they were said to discover in my placid countenance when an 'infant,' of an intense regard for truth and a penchant for fire-crackers. Perhaps they fondly imagined that, in my journey through this 'vale of tears'—as some gentleman feelingly remarks—I would take, for a motto, the story of the youthful G. Washington and his hatchet, which is related with such telling effect in McGuffey's Second Reader, second edition.

Notwithstanding my euphonous cognomen, and the prestige of high moral excellence which it unavoidably clothes its wearer, I have been unfortunate. My 'star' has been undergoing a painful eclipse, for some time, and has finally ceased to 'twinkle.' That eminently useful organ in the human anatomy, the heart, has in my case, undergone horrid mutilation.

Some time since, I received a letter from my only remaining aunt, requesting me to 'come out and stay a month or so.' Business being particularly dull at that time, I concluded to accept the invitation forthwith; and, wishing to give my venerable relative an agreeable—as I flattered myself—surprise, I determined on answering her letter in person.

After arranging my business affairs for a protracted absence, and informing the folks at 'home'—as I distastefully termed my boarding-house—I took the cars, one pleasant afternoon, en route for my aunt's. Owing, possibly, to my usual ill luck, the cars ran off the track, and were otherwise detained, until it was near midnight when they arrived at the little station where I was to get off. The distance from this station to my aunt's residence, was something over a mile, but the moon shone cheerily, and I soon accomplished it; arriving just in time to find that aunt, cousins, and all had retired. Not wishing to arouse the inmates, I determined on entering the house at a back window, which, on former visits, I had noticed was usually unfastened; forgetting, in my anxiety to avoid making any disturbance, that my aunt usually kept a large mastiff—which she facetiously called 'Beauty'—in the room I intended entering. Raising the window slowly and carefully, I succeeded in getting my head, one shoulder and foot through the aperture, when, with a bound, 'Beauty' fastened on my foot and proceeded to shake it vigorously. Not daring to scream, I endeavored, in my most confidential and persuasive tones, to induce his dogship to let go his hold; but all to no purpose. He only shook the harder. A happy thought struck me—I would caress that dog!—I put him on the head! Brilliant idea! He certainly could not withstand such demonstrations of affection. Why had I not thought of it before? I reached out my hand to commence the work of conciliation, when, clog! down came the window on my ribs, breaking, as I piously believed, every bone in my body, and eliciting yells rivaling in sweetness those of a prima donna in the most extatic operatic flights. Presently I heard quite a commotion in the main part of the house; and before I could think what to say or do, one of my cousins, a young gentleman of eighteen winters, appeared in the door, with a candle in one hand and an old Revolutionary musket in the other. No sooner had he recognized me than—but I forbear describing the scene that ensued. I shall not lower my character for veracity by attempting it.

Next morning, at the breakfast table, my aunt made the following pleasant remark: 'Miss Ashland, permit me to introduce you to my nephew, Mr. Stokes.'

That young lady did permit it, and I was happy. Miss Genevieve Ashland was a school girl acquaintance of one of my cousins, intelligent, well informed, and witty; and what, with a fine person, and easy, graceful manners, it is not strange that my (Stokes') heart was forced to succumb before my visit ended.

Five weeks I stayed at my aunt's. During that time my cousins and 'Genie'—as that young lady sentimentally gave her devoted Stokes leave to call her—instigated a series of parties, pic nics, &c., that were, as the ladies expressed it, 'perfectly delightful.' Genie always managed to have me at her side, it was I who had the exquisite pleasure of gathering and presenting outlandish nosegays to I, estimable young woman; nobody but I, devoted Stokes, could pick up her glove or handkerchief. Every day I walked with her, rode with her, quoted sentimental

poetry at her, until I was confident that she liked, perhaps—loved me!

'Lucky man,' thought I, at the end of my fourth week, 'here is a young lady—angel, rather—who has all the qualifications to make you happy, who does now, or doubtless will, love you; marry her, Stokes, and be happy.'

Thinking thus, I resolved, the first opportunity that presented itself, to fill to overflowing the cup of Miss Genie's joys, by making her an offer of my hand.

But, ah!

All my bright imaginings, anticipations, and gothic air-castles, were destined to be unceremoniously upset. Even now, when I think of that mournful episode in my life, 'tears, idle tears,' as A. Tennyson correctly observes, unavoidably obscure my vision. I, G. Washington Stokes, weep.

"Oh, ever thus, from childhood's hour,
I've seen my fondest hopes decay;
I never loved a truer lover,
But 'twas the first to fade away."

But I anticipate.

About a week after I had so magnanimously resolved on making Miss Genie happy, we were walking slowly homeward from a picnic, which had been given by the young people as a sort of farewell, I having fixed that evening for my return home. Coming to a large oak tree, Genie expressed herself weary with the walk, and wished to rest. Accordingly, she sat down at the foot of the tree, on a large root, which had grown out of the ground, and I, nothing loth, followed her example, thinking that 'now or never' was the time to 'pop' the momentous question. Ye powers! what an undertaking! Old gentleman, as you read this, have you entirely forgotten your feelings when you asked that demure old lady over there in the corner, to be yours through life, in sickness and in health, in prosperity and adversity? No. The faintlike feeling in your stomach, trembling in the knees, and the uncertainty of utterance which you experienced on that momentous occasion, can never be obliterated from your memory.

I digress.

Finally, after the conversation had been flagging some minutes, by a mighty effort I arose, and in a tone of voice suited to the occasion, commenced:

'Genie, there are moments in one's life, when, if the lips refused utterance to the feelings of the heart, that indispensable article would undoubtedly break into several distinct pieces.' I was confident that speech would tell. She remained silent and I proceeded:

'Five weeks, Genie, I have been with you almost constantly; and in those five weeks my heart has experienced new feelings—new sensations—and—'

'Oh, Mr. Stokes! what a funny man! Please get me that wild rose that looks so pretty, over there by the stream,' saying which, the young lady proceeded to make herself as comfortable as possible.

I walked off, feeling very savage, procured the 'wild rose' that looked so pretty, and presented it in a very lofty manner to Miss Genie. My confidence was considerably shaken by this little incident, but, like the tenacious Mr. Brown, I thought it would 'never do to give it up so.'

'Genie,' faltered I, 'can you think kindly of one loves the very atmosphere which you breathe, the grass upon which you tread, and yourself dearer than life?—can you—will you—be my—wife!' By this time I was in a beautiful state of trepidation, and stood before her in one of my most awkward attitudes, awaiting my (Stokes') doom.

'La! no, Mr. Stokes, how would it sound—Mrs. Genevieve Stokes! Could not think of such a thing, possibly.'

Heavens, how refreshing!

Three months after my earthly happiness had undergone the above mournful infliction, I received a paper containing the following choice bit of information:

'MARRIED—On the 21st inst., at the residence of the bride's father, by Rev. Nathaniel Ding, Mr. Abraham Snodgrass to Miss Genevieve Ashland.'

Mentally wishing my name had been 'Snodgrass,' we carefully laid the paper containing the notice into an adjacent water-bucket.

Lucky man—Snodgrass!

Sentiment of the Army.

Captain Putnam of the 31st Ohio, in a letter dated Somerset, Kentucky, December 30, addressed to Waldo Taylor, Esq., of Newark, says: "Tell Mr. Morgan that he can state on authority that the North American was mistaken when it said the army was in favor of the policy of Cameron and Cochrane. American soldiers will not allow themselves to be degraded by being marched in the ranks with negroes, and all the officers of my acquaintance would resign rather than participate in such a brutal warfare. If that policy is settled upon, you may look for me in Newark in short meter."

Are You for the Union?

Go out, reader, among your republican acquaintances, male or female, in any city, town or neighborhood in Ohio; tell them that you are for the Constitution and the Union, and, if they suspect you of Democratic tendencies, the question will be instantly put: 'Do you prefer slavery to the Union?' If you allege that there is no such issue before the country, and answer their question, Yankee-like, by propounding another, namely: 'Do you prefer the abolition of slavery to the Union?' you will be answered by a toss of the head and an indignant frown: 'If slavery must be preserved, let the Union go to grass.'

If you affirm that you would preserve slavery only so far as it is guaranteed by the Constitution, you will be met by this or a similar rebuff—'A Constitution which guarantees slavery is not worth preserving.'

We do not exaggerate. Every man can readily test the truth of what we assert. This anti-Union—anti-Constitution radicalism is rife in the Republican party—so wide spread, active and controlling is it, that even the more staid and conservative portion of the party are so infected by it, that no Republican man or journal, with here and there an honorable exception, dare oppose its bold disunion assumptions, save in a half-hearted milk-and-water-way.

Not long since, these self same radicals were vociferous in their shouts for the Union and unrelenting in stigmatizing every man who counseled moderation and forbearance, as a secessionist. Now, they declare they would not consent to a restoration of the Union as it was a year ago, with slavery in it. They are doing all they can to discourage and prevent such restoration by saying that unless slavery is abolished by the act of Congress or the Federal Government, the rebellion can never be put down, or as Greeley in his Tribune words it—that we can never conquer twelve millions of Southerners, but that with the aid of four million blacks, we may be able to overcome eight millions of whites.

It is not necessary to expose the falsity or the treacherous character of these assumptions. We believe the mass of the people will not be misled by them. They will soon come to regard, as they are already beginning to do, every one who derides the Union our fathers made or spurns allegiance to the Constitution its form, as a secessionist and a traitor!—Statesman.

Abolition Treason Manifesting Itself Unmasked.

We have repeatedly and oft told our readers that Abolitionism was treason. Some have not believed it; some few have. In addition to the many evidences adduced by us from time to time in support of this allegation, we produce an editorial article from the New York Tribune of the 26th ult., which leaves no responsible room for doubt on the question involved, so far as the Tribune is regarded as an organ of Abolitionism.

Here is the article. We ask for it a dispassionate perusal:

"Speaking for ourselves, we can honestly say that for that old Union which was kept in existence by southern menaces and northern concessions, we have no regrets and no wish for its reconstruction. Who wants any Union which can only be preserved by systematic wrong and organized political blunders? Who wants any Union which is nothing but a sentiment or a lacker Fourth of July orations withal? Who wants to see represented in the next quarter of a century, the trials, tortures, insults and embarrassments to which we have already been subjected; and especially this continually impending and always convenient threat of treason, whenever an obnoxious policy is to be forced, in the interest of slavery, upon us—who want to see this restored to its old and magical potency—intimidating the weak, ever-persuading the peaceful, seducing the honest and the honorable, making mere heathenish jumble of our Christianity, and mere temporary subterfuge of our laws? Who wants a Union maintained only at the capricious will of a South Carolina aristocracy—a Union which we are bound to respect, but which slaveholders are chartered to disregard at sovereign pleasure?—Union, that the man-owning oligarchy may crawl comfortably along in the fat slime of its indolence and injustice, while we keep watch and ward, with obsequious fidelity over its lazy interests, and submit without a murmur to its whimsicalities of selfishness or passion?"

If any one wants more or stronger evidence than the foregoing that Abolitionists do not want the Union as it existed to be restored, then no proof can convince them. What Abolitionists desire is the abolishment of slavery, not the restoration of the seceded States to the Union, not the preservation of our present Constitution, but the substitution thereof of Sewardism as developed in his higher law doctrines and as manifested in his higher law practice.